

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THR CALIFORNIA, L.P., a Delaware
Limited Partnership,

Plaintiff,

v.

RAFAEL ACEVEDO, DOES 1 to 10,
inclusive,

Defendant.

No. CV 13-8373 UA (DUTYx)

ORDER SUMMARILY REMANDING
ACTION TO STATE COURT

The Court will remand this "Complaint for Unlawful Detainer Action Based on Code of Civil Procedure Section 1161a," Case No. 13H00678, to state court summarily because Defendant removed it improperly.

On November 12, 2013, Defendant Maria Rodriguez, having been sued in what appears to be a routine unlawful detainer action in California state court, lodged a Notice of Removal of that action to this Court and also presented an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

The Court has denied the *in forma pauperis* application under separate cover because the action, again, was not properly removed. To prevent the action from remaining in jurisdictional limbo, the Court issues this Order to remand the action to state court.

///

///

Simply stated, as the Court has previously determined, Plaintiff could not have brought this action in federal court in the first place, in that Defendant does not competently allege facts supplying either diversity or federal-question jurisdiction, and therefore removal is improper. 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a); *see Exxon Mobil Corp v. Allapattah Svcs., Inc.*, 545 U.S. 546, 563, 125 S. Ct. 2611, 162 L. Ed. 2d 502 (2005). Even if complete diversity of citizenship existed, the amount in controversy does not exceed the diversity-jurisdiction threshold of \$75,000. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332, 1441(b). On the contrary, the unlawful-detainer complaint recites that the amount in controversy does not exceed \$10,000.

Nor does Plaintiff's unlawful detainer action raise any federal legal question. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1441(b).

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that (1) this matter be REMANDED to the Superior Court of California, Los Angeles, Chatsworth Courthouse, 9425 Penfield Avenue, Chatsworth, California 91311 for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c); (2) that the Clerk send a certified copy of this Order to the state court; and (3) that the Clerk serve copies of this Order on the parties.


IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 11/27/13



GEORGE H. KING
Chief United States District Judge

Presented by:



/S/ FREDERICK F. MUMM
FREDERICK F. MUMM
United States Magistrate Judge